

### REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the present application. The Office Action, however, tentatively rejected claims 1-6 and 11-13. Claims 1, 6 and 11-13 have been amended to more clearly identify a novel and non-obvious aspect of certain inventive embodiments. Support for these amendments can be found on the specification of the present invention, and therefore the amendments add no new matter to the application.

In view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow, it is requested that the rejections of the record be reconsidered and withdrawn. In this regard, claims 1-6 and 11-13 clearly define over the cited art.

The Office Action rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, indicating that the claim term "the channel selection" lacked antecedent support. Claim 6 has been amended herein to address and overcome this issue, and the rejection should accordingly be withdrawn.

### **Discussion of 102 Rejections**

Claims 1-3 and 11-12 were tentatively rejected under 35 USC 102 as allegedly anticipated by Schrader (U.S. Patent No. 6,313,464). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these rejections.

As amended, independent claims 1 and 11 recite:

1. A method for light signal reception, comprising the steps of:
  - (A) transmitting a light beam to a target;
  - (B) receiving the light beam reflected from the target and outputting a first received signal, wherein the received signal has at least one pulse;

(C) eliminating pulses smaller than a reference voltage level in the first received signal and determining whether a pulse is higher than the reference voltage level in the first received signal;

(D) outputting the pulse to a processor to execute operational processes when the pulse in the first received signal is higher than the reference voltage level;

(E) repeating the steps (A) and (B) to obtain a second received signal when, in the first received signal, no pulse is higher than the reference voltage level; and

(F) *amplifying the second received signal and outputting to the processor to determine the distance between the target and a ranger finder according to the pulse or the amplified second received signal.*

11. A device, comprising:

a transmitter transmitting a light beam to a target;

a receiver receiving the light beam reflected from the target and outputting a corresponding received signal;

a comparison circuit having a reference voltage level, and receiving the received signal to determine whether a pulse is higher than the reference voltage level, in the received signal;

a gain circuit receiving the received signal from the receiver to amplify and output a corresponding amplified signal; and

*a processor receiving and processing the pulse or the amplified signal to determine the distance between the target and a ranger finder.*

(*Emphasis added.*) Claims 1 and 11 patently define over the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art fails to disclose or suggest the features emphasized above.

As recited cited in independent claims 1 and 11, the distance between the target and a ranger finder is determined according to the pulse or the amplified second received signal. As Schrader does not teach such features as recited in the claims 1 and 11, Schrader does not disclose all features of the present invention. Insofar as claims 2-3 depend from claim 1 and claim 12 depends from claim 11, these claims patently define over Schrader for at least the same reasons.

### **Discussion of 103 Rejection**

Claims 4-5 and 13 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as allegedly unpatentable over Schrader (U.S. Patent No. 6,313,464).

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP 2142.

As recited in amended claim 1, the distance between the target and a ranger finder is determined according to the pulse or the amplified second received signal. Likewise, as recited in amended claim 11, a processor receives and processes the pulse or the amplified signal to determine the distance between the target and a ranger finder. As Schrader fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, *inter alia*, those claimed features, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should be withdrawn.

Under MPEP2143, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art reference (or reference when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Since the cited references do not teach the above-quoted limitations of claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 should be allowed. Likewise, claim 5 should be allowed at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this amendment and response. If, however, any fee is deemed to be payable, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to Deposit Account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

  
Daniel R. McClure, Reg. No. 38,962

**Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, LLP**  
100 Galleria Pkwy, NW  
Suite 1750  
Atlanta, GA 30339  
770-933-9500